

Two years ago, Glenda, who is Latinx, was fired after reporting racial discrimination. Unknown to her, buried in the fine print of the employment agreement she signed along with other onboarding documents when she was first hired was a forced arbitration clause, so Glenda had no choice but to go into forced arbitration proceedings.

But as the article notes, "Instead of the simple and fair process that arbitration promises to be, Perez saw her claim dismissed without so much as a hearing, only to learn later that her apparently independent arbitrator was so friendly with the attorney representing Cigna that the arbitrator invited him to his 50th birthday party."

To no surprise, the arbitrator sided with Glenda's employer, Cigna.

When her husband, Peter, complained about the unfairness of the process and how the arbitrator truly was not independent, guess what? He too was fired.

Now Glenda and Peter are struggling to support themselves and their three children and trying to fight their wrongful termination in court.

No worker should ever have to go through what Glenda and Peter have endured. This is why I support ending forced arbitration by voting for the FAIR Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues who care about justice, who care about fairness, to support the FAIR Act.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her comments on this Special Order. As she said at the end, she is one of the loudest voices to make sure there is justice in this country.

Madam Speaker, we could tell many more stories tonight, but I am going to close now by thanking all of my colleagues from the Democratic Women's Caucus for sharing the stories of women and men who are hurt by forced arbitration and demonstrating the human impact of this corrupt and abusive practice.

We are eager to have the House of Representatives take a vote on the FAIR Act on the House floor because survivors deserve their day in court and workers deserve dignified and respectful workplaces.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

MODERNIZING SANCTIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-61)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in view of multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 1373 of September 28, 2001, Resolution 1526 of January 30, 2004, Resolution 1988 of June 17, 2011, Resolution 1989 of June 17, 2011, Resolution 2253 of December 17, 2015, Resolution 2255 of December 21, 2015, Resolution 2368 of July 20, 2017, and Resolution 2462 of March 28, 2019, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") modernizing sanctions to combat terrorism.

I have determined that it is necessary to consolidate and enhance sanctions to combat acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism by foreign terrorists, acts that are recognized and condemned in the above-referenced United Nations Security Council resolutions. I have terminated the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, and revoked Executive Order 12947, as amended by Executive Order 13099 of August 20, 1998. The order builds upon the initial steps taken in Executive Order 12947 and takes additional steps to deal with the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to the continuing and immediate threat of grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, which include acts of terrorism that threaten the Middle East peace process.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 9, 2019.

SUPPORT D.C. STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon because of the importance of a coming date. It will be known as a historic date in the Congress of the United States, Thursday, September 19, which is the day that, prerequisite to coming to the floor, the Committee on Oversight and Reform will hold the first hearing on D.C. statehood, H.R. 51, in 26 years. That will be a historic hearing.

This is not an informational hearing to let us know about statehood. It is a jurisdictional hearing, the prerequisite to going to the House floor.

The residents of the District of Columbia, who are number one—mark that fact—number one in taxes paid to support the Government of the United States, do not have full rights, the same rights, as other Americans.

Yes, I can come to the House floor to speak any time I want to, and yes, with

Democrats in power, I have reclaimed the Committee of the Whole vote, which means that when the committee is gathered here in the House voting on at least some matters, I get to vote. But, Madam Speaker, on final votes, I cannot vote, even though, as you have heard, the people I represent contribute more Federal taxes than any people in the United States, more per capita than New York and California and Florida. You name the State, you will be talking about a State where, per capita, its residents contribute less to support the very government that is ours and theirs than the people of the District of Columbia.

So, yes, I have introduced the D.C. statehood bill.

Let me predict right now that that bill will pass. It has virtually enough cosponsors to pass. Most bills come to this House floor without many cosponsors, and yet we know they will pass. Well, when you have almost enough cosponsors to pass the bill, Madam Speaker, I say to my good friends who are not on the bill, this is the time to get on the bill so that they will be part of history. I do believe this bill will, in fact, pass the House of Representatives.

There has already been a forecast that that will happen. That forecast was in H.R. 1, which has already passed the House. Every Democratic Member voted for H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 contains findings for D.C. statehood. It found that District residents pay the highest taxes per capita, that residents of your Nation's Capital have fulfilled all the obligations of statehood, fighting in all of the Nation's wars, including the war that gave rise to the United States of America itself.

It found that there were no historical, constitutional, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 residents of your Nation's Capital should not become part of a state.

These are findings in H.R. 1 that every Democrat has already voted for. These were findings for statehood for the District of Columbia.

It found that the District is in one of the strongest fiscal positions in the United States: a \$14.6 billion budget, a surplus of \$2.8 billion, total personal income higher than that of seven States, per capita personal consumption expenditures higher than those of any State, and total personal consumption expenditures greater than those of seven States.

We are not talking about an entity not worthy of statehood. The qualifications are clear, and there are qualifications to become a state.

How do you become a state? You get voted a state by a majority vote in this House. It is hard to become a state, but those qualifications have been met.

Let us compare the District of Columbia to States that are already States. Let's take two States of the Union, Vermont and Wyoming. I begrudge them nothing, except to say